

#

.HE 1

Special Civil Application No 2442 of 95

Date of decision: 11/12/95

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKER

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

DHARMENDRASINH K GOHIL

vs

STATE OF GUJART

Appearence: MR RJ OZA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA f r RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA fo Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR D BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for etitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for R spondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA AMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Pe itioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for Res ondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BA BHANIA for RespondentA for Petitioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for RespondentA for Peti ioner MR DA BAMBHANIA for d

ORAL JUDGEMENT

This petition is filed against the action by which adverse remarks were made in the service records of the petitioner for the period between April 1 1991 and February 15, 1992. It appears that the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Collector, Bhavnagar District, Bhavnagar, respondent no.2 herein. The respondent no.2 by his order dt. February 3, 1994 rejected the appeal on the ground that as per the the remarks made by the officer who had written confidential report, adverse entries were justified. He on his part did not consider the appeal filed by the petitioner and has dismissed by

by the appellate authority,

Various contentions were raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner. In my opinion, it is not necessary to deal with all the contentions. In view of the fact that the appellate authority, namely, the respondent has not considered all the grounds on which the petitioner felt himself aggrieved by the order passed by the officer who had put the adverse remarks against the petitioner, it is directed that the second respondent will hear the petitioner and pass appropriate order in accordance with law after recording reasons.

The petition is accordingly disposed of by making rule made absoluteon
is accordingly disposed of by making rule made absoluteon is accordingly dispo
ed of by making rule made absoluteon is accordingly disposed of by making rule
made absoluteon is accordingly disposed of by making rule made absoluteon is a
ccordingly disposed of by making rule made absoluteon is accordingly disposed o

